UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,079	11/16/2001	Valery Tsourikov	IMC-43	4738

29344 7590 10/18/2007

MILLS & ONELLO LLP
ELEVEN BEACON STREET
SUITE 605
BOSTON, MA 02108

EXAMINER	
SPOONER, LAMONT M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/991,079	TSOURIKOV ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lamont M. Spooner	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 July 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 November 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/30/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding, Hatton, claim 1, "Hatton requires two input statements: a problem statement and a goal declaration." The Examiner does not argue this point, **however at no instance can this not be interpreted as a query element**, which encompasses applicant's claim limitation. Furthermore, Hatton's query element includes the part of speech requirements of the claim limitation. The applicant is permitted to be his own lexicographer, yet if the applicant has a specific intended meaning for "query" or (S-A-O) the Examiner request the definition to be included in applicant's claim. Applicant further discusses an analogy System in Hatton. While the Examiner notes an analogy system in Hatton, the Examiner further notes, that each claimed element by applicant is addressed. Wherein, applicant focuses on "protect", p.9 paragraph 3, "but "protect" was not a query element in Hatton." However, "bark" is a query element, and it is included in the query and response, and further is in the knowledge base, and "protect" is furthermore

a semantic processed information associated with a plurality of available answers in the form of S-A-O. The Examiner further requests the applicant to distinguish the **claimed** elements from Hatton. Despite argued differences, as claimed, Hatton encompasses applicants claimed invention as rejected.

As per applicant's arguments regarding claim 2, the Examiner notes that Hatton does not explicitly teach wherein said server conducts a search of the World Wide Web, (identifies documents that include new answer S-A-O's each comprising an element or elements that match the one or more query elements, stores links to such documents, and adds such new answer S-A-O's to the knowledge base, and wherein the server includes, as part of the second signals, representations of each of the new answer S-A-O's). However, the use of communication devices and searching, identifying, and linking to documents, on the Internet and World Wide Web are old and well known in the art as admitted by Applicant in the Background of the invention ("**[T]o such systems capable of receiving a user entered question, processing the data representing the question, searching local and/or web based databases for information relevant to an answer to user's query, and conveying**

such answer information to the user"). Therefore, one having **ordinary skill in the art** at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate a communication device **within Hatton's search method for accessing the Internet for web based answers**, with the motivation of providing user access to the numerous fundamental technical publications thereby expanding the system's capability to retrieve that information which is important to the user. The Examiner is pointing out, that in **combination** with Hatton and the applicant's background section, claim 2 is thus rendered obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding claim 3, the Examiner has provided a new rejection based on the current amendment. "

In response to applicant's arguments regarding claim 4, the Examiner has interpreted the claim as the response to the user (query or presented expressions) to search. Furthermore, as claimed, this is the best interpretation the Examiner is able to make, wherein the claim calls for an automatic search (see claim 3), yet there is a query to the user to initiate a search command, which the Examiner interprets as negating any automatic searching process. Therefore, as interpreted by the Examiner, any query to

the user which allows the user to search, is thereby a search command to the system.

In response to applicants arguments regarding claims 8, 15, 5-7, 9-10 and 16-19, the Examiner finds the arguments unpersuasive as applicant's dependent arguments are unpersuasive.

In response to applicants arguments regarding claim 20, "Levin does not disclose "converting the A-O problem statement into a URL..." the Examiner cannot concur, as Levin explicitly teaches these lacking elements (C.6.lines 13-55, wherein the Action-Object is converted into a URL by mapping conversion, query results on web page are sufficient web page solutions as claimed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatton (US 6,269,356).

As per **claims 1 and 12**, Hatton teaches a system enabling a user to ask a question (query) and for providing the user with one or more answers or solutions to such question, the system comprising:

user apparatus for automatically generating first signals representative of a natural language user query that includes one or more query elements comprising (A-0), (S-A), o-r-(S-X-O), or (S) (C.13.line 17, Fig. 5. His problem statement);

a knowledge base of semantically and automatically processed information including a plurality of available answers in the form of S-A-O's (C.6.lines 38-57, Fig. 5),

identify from the one or more query elements at least one knowledge base element S, O, or A, or (A-O) associated with at least one respective knowledge base answer S-A-O that includes the one or more query element, in response to the server receiving the first signals (C.6.lines 4-6, C.7.lines 20-24); and

generate second signals representative of the at least one answer S-A-O, wherein the user apparatus is configured to generate a natural language audio message or visual display of the at least one

answer S-A-O in response to receiving the second signals (C.13.lines 10-19); and

communication devices configured to transmit the first signals from the user apparatus and to the user apparatus (ibid, Fig. 5).

It is noted that Hatton teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach a server for storing a knowledge base and for transmitting the first signals for the user apparatus to the server and for transmitting the second signals from the server to the user apparatus". Hatton's system appears to retrieve a data stored locally in the computer's knowledge base(Fig. 5). However, the use of a server for storing a knowledge base and the use of communications from the user (client) to the server are well known in the art. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time then invention was made would have it obvious to store the knowledge base in a server because it would facilitate many user to retrieve information that is of interest to them and therefore expand the system's capability.

As per **claims 2 and 13**, it is further noted that Hatton does not explicitly teach wherein said server conducts a search of the World Wide Web, (Identifies documents that include new answer S-A-O's each

comprising an element or elements that match the one or more query elements, stores links to such documents, and adds such new answer S-A-O's to the knowledge base, and wherein the server includes, as part of the second signals, representations of each of the new answer S-A-O's).

However, the use of communication devices and searching, identifying, and linking to documents, on the Internet and World Wide Web are old and well known in the art as admitted by Applicant in the Background of the invention ("[T]o such systems capable of receiving a user entered question, processing the data representing the question, searching local and/or web based databases for information relevant to an answer to user's query, and conveying such answer information to the user"). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate a communication device within Hatton's search method for accessing the Internet for web based answers, with the motivation of providing user access to the numerous fundamental technical publications thereby expanding the system's capability to retrieve that information which is important to the user.

As per **claims 3 and 14**, Hatton with applicants background make obvious claim 2, Hatton further teach wherein conducting search automatically in response to the server determining that no knowledge base element or elements matches the one or more query element or in response to a user search command (Fig. 5. his problem statement into the user interface as the search command, C.1.lines 15, 16-his query, C.2 lines 7-15- the no element match, automatically provides search), but lacks said server conducts the search.. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to combine Hatton with applicant's background, thus providing the benefit of automatically search expansion thus providing an expanded source of information for search to resolve a problem/query.

4. Claims 4, 8 and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatton in view of Lamberti et al. (Lamberti, 5,377,103).

As per **claims 4 and 15**, Hatton with applicant's background make obvious claim 3, but lacks explicitly teaching wherein said server is programmed to query the user to determine if user wants to initiate the user search command. However, Lamberti et al. teach wherein said server is programmed to query the user...user search command (col. 6,

lines 4-26). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify the combination of applicant's background with Hatton's search with Lamberti's query for initiating the search, the motivation being to reduce the potential for error before searching.

As per **claim 8**, Hatton makes obvious claim 1 and further teach wherein said user apparatus includes a user digital computer for generating said first signals and receiving said second signals "(figure 5, C.5.lines 28-35).

As per **claim 11**, Hatton makes obvious claim 1 and further teach wherein said second signals represent each_ answer S-A-O in sentence format (C.13.line18).

5. Claims 5-7, 9-10, 16-19, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatton (US 6,269,356) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Johnson (5,748,974).

As per **claim 5**, Hatton et al makes obvious claim 1, and teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach wherein user apparatus converts human voice signals into said first signals. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Johnson who teach a

multimodal natural language interface that enables users to combine natural language (spoken, typed or handwritten) using a speech recognizer to convert the speech signal into text at the abstract and figure 2 (his speech input). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into Lamberti' s system a speech recognizer because it allow expand the capability of the system by allowing user to enter their input speaking it that would facilitate users who cannot type.

As per **claims 6-7, 9-10 and 16-19**, Johnson teaches wherein user apparatus converts second signals into audio signals (his output response generator 54).

6. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatton (US 6,269,356) in view of Levin et al. (Levin, US 6,173,279).

As per **claim 20**, claim 20 sets forth limitations similar to claims 1 and 2, and are thus rejected for the same reasons and under the same rationale. Hatton lacks teaching URL, and processing the url..., an HTML page to the user device, processing the at least one HTML page ...to output a solution to the user query. However, Levin et al. teaches all of these lacking elements (C.6.lines 13-55). Therefore, at the time of the

invention, it would have been obvious to modify Hatton with Levin's Web search query system. Providing the benefit of natural language query through a plurality of data resources, including the Web (abstract).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571/272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms
10/03/07

PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER